

Application No. 10/046,283
Amendment Dated **January 15, 2004**
Reply to Office Action of December 5, 2003
Attorney Docket No. RPL-0026

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-9, and the Abstract are amended and claims 10-20 are added. Support for new claims 10-20 can be found in the original specification including the claims and the figures, for example, see Figs. 7-9. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objects to paragraph 35 and the Abstract. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments obviate the grounds for the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Office Action states that claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action on page 3, last full paragraph, states that “the specification does not enable one skilled in the art to apply the scan pulse to the electrodes in two different directions.” However, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis of the claimed invention is not in the

Application No. 10/046,283
Amendment Dated **January 15, 2004**
Reply to Office Action of December 5, 2003
Attorney Docket No. RPL-0026

“direction” in which the scan pulse is applied to electrodes, but rather in which order the scan pulse is applied to scan electrodes. Applicant respectfully submits that as illustrated in Fig. 7 of the claimed application invention, within the first sub-field, the scan pulse is applied first to the scanned-electrode line 1, then to the second scanned-electrode line 2 and so on until the final scanned-electrode line 480. Also, in sub-field 2, the scan pulse is initially applied to the first scanned-electrode line 480, then to the second scanned-electrode line 479, and so on until the final scanned-electrode line 1. Therefore, the scan pulse is not applied in “two different directions,” but rather is applied in a different order.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 are allowable. As the amendments to claims 1-9 were merely to correct formalities, Applicant respectfully submits that should another rejection be applied to at least claims 1-9, such rejection should be made non-final. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejections claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,446 B1, hereinafter Kanazawa). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kanazawa appears to disclose sustaining discharge signals that are mutually out of phase applied alternately to adjoining ones of first electrodes and adjoining ones of second electrodes respectively. See Kanazawa Abstract. By alternately applying signals an interlacing can occur

Application No. 10/046,283
Amendment Dated **January 15, 2004**
Reply to Office Action of December 5, 2003
Attorney Docket No. RPL-0026

where the first display cells and second display cells are allowed alternately and repeatedly to glow for display. See Kanazawa Abstract. However, Kanazawa fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in at least claim 1, at least the feature of applying a scan pulse to scan electrodes in order of 1, 2, ... N-1 and N and applying a scan pulse to scan electrodes of N, N-1, ... 2 and 1.

The Office Action states on page 5, last full paragraph, that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Kanazawa by having one driving sequence be from 1 to N and the other driving sequence be from N to 1. One would have been motivated to make such a change in order to specify a direction of the driving sequence, given that there are already two separate driving sequences and scan drivers ... , particularly since Kanazawa appears capable of performing the driving sequence in either direction and it would appear to be a matter of routine design choice as to which direction it should be given.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees as no motivation has been provided other than to “specify a direction of driving sequence” or “a matter of routine design choice.” Furthermore, no mention of a driving sequence is discussed within Kanazawa, let alone any reason or motivation for providing any such driving sequence.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/046,283
Amendment Dated **January 15, 2004**
Reply to Office Action of December 5, 2003
Attorney Docket No. RPL-0026

IV. NEW CLAIMS

By this Amendment, claims 10-20 are added to the application. Claims 10-20 broadly recite features of the preferred embodiment(s). It is respectfully submitted that the new claims are allowable over the references of record for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1-3.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Laura L. Lee**, at the telephone number listed below.

Application No. 10/046,283
Amendment Dated **January 15, 2004**
Reply to Office Action of December 5, 2003
Attorney Docket No. RPL-0026

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Eisenhart', written over the printed name.

John C. Eisenhart, Esq.
Registration No. 36,128
Laura L. Lee, Esq.
Registration No. 48,752

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/JCE/LLL:knv:gre
Date: January 15, 2004